

From: Peter H. Gleick

Sent: Friday, December 10, 2004 9:08 AM

To: Guivetchi, Kamyar

Cc: B160 Project Team; Cowin, Mark; Beutler, Lisa; Alemi, Manucher; Davidoff, Baryohay; Matyac, Scott

Subject: Re: Comments on Briefing Materials

Kamyar,

I greatly appreciate your response. Thank you.

If I might offer two suggestions:

1. whatever the units of the scenario cartoon, have one of the curves level or declining.
2. make clear that the upper end of the AWUE number is unknown. The way the graph looks now, it appears to place an upper limit at a very small number. Hence my suggestion for a change in the graphic itself, AND a footnote of some kind.

Thanks.

Peter

At 04:56 PM 12/9/04, Guivetchi, Kamyar wrote:

Peter:

Thank you for taking time to review the AC Briefing material, especially since you won't be able to participate on Friday.

Regarding your first concern --- The plot you note is not a plot of water use or need. This was used only as an icon/image to characterize that we are considering multiple future scenarios based on different assumptions, like population growth. As such it does not have a title or units on the y-axis. However, we plan to change this icon on future presentations to make sure it is not mistaken for projections of water use. For future water use, our water demand estimates for the three scenarios are consistent with your observation -- that net statewide water demand could level off or even decrease in the future.

Regarding your second comment -- we have circulated the Ag WUE narrative for review several times and the numbers presented in the bar chart are the ones cited in the narrative. Others have raised your concern that the upper end of the range is too low. We have based the range on available studies. At the same time, I know that DWR staff is working with CALFED on revising the Ag WUE estimate. I have asked them to provide us the updated numbers when they are available.

I am copying Manucher Alemi, Baryohay Davidoff and Scott Matyac on this email, and ask them to let us know where they are in the process to update the

Ag WUE estimates for 2030. Perhaps updated numbers will be available before we go to print.

Thanks again for commenting and let me know if you have questions or want to discuss this further. I hope to see you at the January 20 AC meeting, if not sooner.

Take Care,

Kamyar

Kamyar Guivetchi, P.E.

Manager, Statewide Water Planning

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Mail: P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236

Phone: (916) 653-3937

FAX: (916) 651-9289

Email: kamyarg@water.ca.gov

Web: www.waterplan.water.ca.gov

From: Peter H. Gleick [<mailto:pgleick@pipeline.com>]

Sent: Thursday, December 09, 2004 2:52 PM

To: Sajac, Virginia; Dabbs, Paul

Cc: B160_proj_team@dop.water.ca.gov

Subject: Re: Friday, Dec. 10 briefings

Dear All,

I regret I may not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow, but I have reviewed the Water Plan Update powerpoint presentation and I wanted to express two serious concerns.

First, on the slide "New Features, Continued" all three of the "scenario curves" show rapidly increasing water use or need (or something). I think that at least one of these curves should be either level or declining, or peaking and then turning down. **The implication of constantly increasing water demand is inappropriate, not to mention flat wrong.** I attach here a curve of actual California water withdrawals for the past 30 years. Water use in California is NOT increasing and I insist that the assumption that it will in the future not be allowed to go into B160 unchallenged.

Second, on the slide "Range of Water Savings Benefits" with the bar chart of water options, I strongly object to the values show for Agricultural Water Use Efficiency. This number is not based on research and it is not valid. **Shown this way it is highly misleading.** Something must be done on the graph (and in the report text and writeup) to

show that it is a lower limit, without an UPPER limit, or no value should be shown, and there should be a footnote saying: "Inadequate research has been done to permit us at this time to specify potential savings from cost-effective agricultural efficiency improvements."

Peter Gleick

At 06:20 PM 12/8/04, Sajac, Virginia wrote:

Dear Advisory Committee and Project Team members,

Materials for Friday's morning (9:30 to 11:30) and afternoon (1:30 to 3:30) briefings have been posted at the following link:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/b160/committee/meetings.html>.

Both briefings are in the Large Conference Room, 2nd floor, Bonderson Building, 901 P Street (corner of 9th and "P") and both have the same agenda and conference phone number: (916) 657-4114. Please choose either the morning or afternoon briefing.

Meeting goals are to provide updates on:

1. the *Water Plan* draft
2. phase 2
3. public hearings

Thank you for your continued interest! Please let me know if you have any questions.

Virginia Sajac
Water Plan Administrative Support
California Water Plan Update 2004
916.653.7101
<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov>

"Time flies like an arrow. Fruit flies like a banana." -- Groucho Marx

Dr. Peter H. Gleick
Director, 2003 MacArthur Fellow
Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security
654 13th Street
Oakland, California 94612
510 251-1600 phone
510 251-2203 fax

www.worldwater.org (World Water site)
www.pacinst.org (Pacific Institute site)

Dr. Peter H. Gleick
Director, 2003 MacArthur Fellow
Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security
654 13th Street
Oakland, California 94612
510 251-1600 phone
510 251-2203 fax

www.worldwater.org (World Water site)
www.pacinst.org (Pacific Institute site)